

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 19, 20, 22-28, 30 and 32-46 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-12, 19, 20, 22-28, 30 and 32-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. 4,603,496 to Latz et al. (“Latz”), and further in view of US Pat. 6,328,456 to Mize (“Mize”).

Claim 1 has been amended to include a limitation that was previously found only in claims 30 and 42. This language requires, “each curved surface is centered about a radius R extending from a center point that lies directly above an imaginary light point source on each of the LED’s sides...”

In the rejection of claim 30, the office action states, “Latz discloses a method of manufacturing...each curved surface is centered about a radius R extending from a center point that lies directly above an imaginary light point source on each of the LED’s sides (see Figures 2 and 3, and column 2, lines 36-58).”

Figure 2 of Latz merely discloses the layers of the assembly being the LED array 10, the reflector array 12 and the lens array 13. Figure 3 does not show any radius from a center point, nor is there any mention of a center point, or imaginary light point sources on the sides of the LED. As these are not set out anywhere in the disclosure or drawings of Latz, it is speculation on Applicant’s part, but it appears that the relationship would not hold true in Figure 3.

Mize does not cure this deficiency, as Mize is not directed to a lens, but to a portion of the LED itself. As described in Mize, col. 5, lines 25-28, the discussion focuses on the “surface 32 of the LED...” Further, there is no mention or suggestion of a radius from a center point, a center point, or imaginary light point sources on the sides of the LED in Mize. Indeed, because the surface 32 of the LED is so close to the LED, the relationship does not seem to hold true when looking at Figures 6-8 of Mize.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of this claim.

For the reasons as applied to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 30 and 42 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims and their respective dependent claims.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613